

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 SANDRA MIRANDA,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 THOMAS C. HOKINSON (in his
15 individual capacity); ARNOLD
16 NETKA (in his individual capacity);
17 ALFRED SOSA, (in his individual
18 capacity); CITY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND
POWER, DOES 1 – 10,

19 Defendants.
20

CASE NO. **2:07-cv-00609-JHN –RCx**

*[Assigned for all purposes to Hon. District Judge
Jacqueline H. Nguyen and Magistrate Judge Rosalyn
Chapman]*

**AMENDED JUDGMENT ON JURY
VERDICT**

Trial Date: January 25, 2011

21 This action came on regularly for trial on January 25, 2011, in Courtroom 790 of
22 the United States District Court, Honorable Jacqueline H. Nguyen, Judge Presiding;
23 the plaintiff, Sandra Miranda, appearing by attorney Patricia J. Barry; defendants,
24 Thomas C. Hokinson, Arnold E. Netka, and City of Los Angeles Department of Water
25 of Power, appearing by attorney Paul N. Paquette; and defendant, Alfred Sosa,
appearing by attorney Raymond J. Fuentes.

26 A jury was regularly impaneled and sworn. Witnesses were sworn and testified.
27 After hearing the evidence and the argument of counsel, the jury was duly instructed
28 by the Court and the cause was submitted to the jury with directions to return a verdict

1 on special issues. The jury deliberated and thereafter returned into Court on February
2 2, 2011, with its unanimous verdict as follows:

3 “Has plaintiff proven by a preponderance of the evidence that
4 she was subjected to any adverse employment action by one or
5 more of the defendants or their subordinates (a) at their
6 direction; or (b) that defendant set in motion a series of acts by
7 his subordinates that he knew or reasonably should have known
8 would cause the subordinate to deprive plaintiff of her rights; or
9 (c) that defendant knew or reasonably should have known that
10 his subordinates were engaging in these acts that deprived
11 plaintiff of her rights and defendant failed to act to prevent such
12 conduct?

13 Answer: No.”

14 It appearing by reason of said verdict that defendants are entitled to judgment
15 against plaintiff.

16 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED as
17 follows:


- 18 1. That plaintiff take nothing by way of her Complaint on file herein;
19 2. That judgment is entered in favor of defendants; and
20 3. That defendants shall recover \$13,147.71 in statutory costs of suit with
21 interest thereon at the federal rate of interest from and after February 14,
22 2011.

23 DATED: August 31, 2011

24 By: _____

25 JAC

26 Ho: _____

27  _____
28